



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/086,270

02/28/2002

Edward Moseley

ADAPP227

4039

25920 7590 02/09/2007
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP
710 LAKEWAY DRIVE
SUITE 200
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085

EXAMINER

ELAHEE, MD S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2614

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

02/09/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/086,270

Applicant(s)

MOSELEY, EDWARD

Examiner

Md S. Elahee

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-14 and 16-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-14,16-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to an amendment filed on 11/13/2006. Claims 1,3-14 and 16-23 are pending. Claims 2 and 25 have been cancelled. Claims 15 and 24 have been previously cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 11/13/2006 Remarks have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection which is deemed appropriate to address all of the needs at this time.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2614

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 16-18, 19, 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edinger et al. (U.S. 2002/0194047) in view of Sanada et al. (U.S. 2005/0177548) further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art.

Regarding claim 1, with respect to Figures 1-3, Edinger teaches a method of determining a support entitlement level comprising:

receiving a product support request from a customer (fig.1, item 1), wherein the product support request relates to a product manufactured by a receiving party (abstract; page 1, paragraph 0015, page 3, paragraphs 0077, 0078, page 4, paragraph 0090);

receiving a service request ID [i.e., technical support identification (TSID)] from the customer including establishing a data communication with the customer's product unit and automatically interrogating the unit to identify the TSID for the unit (page 4, paragraphs 0087, 0090, 0098, page 5, paragraph 0118) (Note; Since the customer can get help from provider's website through online (see paragraph 0098), whenever system prompts (e.g., DIALOG) the customer (see paragraphs 0118-0119), the system must interact with customer's unit interface.

Art Unit: 2614

Therefore, it is inherent that the system automatically interrogating the unit to identify the TSID for the unit.);

However, Edinger does not specifically teach “at least one of a plurality of aspects of the unit is stored in a computer retrievable location in the unit”. Sanada teaches at least one of a plurality of aspects of the unit is stored in a computer retrievable location in the unit (fig. 14; page 6, paragraph 0094). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Edinger to incorporate at least one of a plurality of aspects of the unit is stored in a computer retrievable location in the unit as taught by Sanada. The motivation for the modification is to retrieve detail information about the particular device for a support team so that the customer can get technical assistance for a particular device.

validating the TSID (page 5, paragraph 0123, page 6, paragraph 0170);

classifying the valid TSID into at least one of a plurality of classifications, wherein the plurality of classifications includes a contract classification (page 5, paragraph 0125, page 6, paragraphs 0126, 0170, 0171, page 7, paragraph 0173)

assigning at least one of a plurality of support levels to the classified TSID wherein the assigned support level corresponds to the TSID classification and wherein the TSID is received, validated, classified and the support level assigned before an agent is notified of the product support request (page 4, paragraph 0098, page 5, paragraph 0125, page 7, paragraph 0173, page 11, paragraph 0290);

enabling delivery of the assigned support level including providing exception handling if the TSID is not valid (page 5, paragraph 0125, page 7, paragraph 0173, page 9, paragraph 0240, page 11, paragraph 0290); and

However, Edinger in view of Sanada does not specifically teach “providing complimentary product support if the TSID is not valid”. Applicant’s admitted prior art teaches providing complimentary product support (fig.1, item 132) if the customer is not authorized any product support [i.e., TSID is not valid] (fig.1, item 110) (page 3, paragraphs 7,8). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Edinger in view of Sanada to incorporate providing complimentary product support if the TSID is not valid as taught by Applicant’s admitted prior art. The motivation for the modification is to provide free technical assistance to satisfy a customer.

Regarding claims 3 and 8, Edinger teaches receiving at least one of a plurality of aspects of a unit from the customer (page 6, paragraph 0128, page 7, paragraph 0173); and

retrieving the TSID from at least one of a plurality of databases, wherein the retrieved TSID matches at least one of the plurality of aspects of the unit in the at least one of the plurality of databases (page 2, paragraph 0027, page 4, paragraphs 0086, 0099, page 5, paragraph 0123, page 7, paragraph 0173).

Regarding claim 5, Edinger teaches that the TSID is numeric (page 3, paragraph 0040).

Regarding claim 7, Edinger teaches classifying the valid TSID as a contract TSID if the TSID identifies at least one of a group consisting of a first support contract and a unit assigned to a second support contract (page 7, paragraph 0173); and

assigning at least one of a plurality of support levels to the classified TSID includes assigning an authorized support level to the contract TSID (page 4, paragraph 0098, page 5, paragraph 0125, page 7, paragraph 0173, page 11, paragraph 0290).

Regarding claim 9, Edinger teaches an email support level, an OEM support level (page 4, paragraphs 0090, 0098).

However, Edinger in view of Sanada further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art does not specifically teach "an end of life support level, a knowledge base support level and an illicit product support level". However, Examiner takes Official Notice that an end of life support level, a knowledge base support level and an illicit product support level are well known in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to incorporate a plurality of support levels in order to handle incoming telephone calls so that the different types of need of customer is met efficiently.

Regarding claim 16, Edinger teaches notifying an agent (page 5, paragraph 0125, page 7, paragraph 0173, page 11, paragraph 0290).

Regarding claim 17, Edinger teaches creating a new incident record, determining if there is an open incident record associated with the TSID (page 5, paragraph 0123).

However, Edinger in view of Sanada further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art does not specifically teach "retrieving the open incident record if the open incident is associated with the TSID and outputting the new incident record and the open incident record to the agent".

Art Unit: 2614

However, Examiner takes Official Notice that retrieving the open incident record if the open incident is associated with the TSID and outputting the new incident record and the open incident record to the agent are well known in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to incorporate retrieving the open incident record if the open incident is associated with the TSID and outputting the new incident record and the open incident record to the agent in order to monitor the status of a problem associated with a product and provide extra care to resolve it.

Claim 18 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Edinger teaches a management model [i.e., automated call distributor (ACD)], wherein the ACD provides access to a customer (fig.2-4; col.7, lines 23-25, 50-65) and wherein the ACD includes:

- a processor (inherent for management model); and
- a database [i.e., memory] system coupled to the processor, wherein the memory system includes instructions executable by the processor (page 4, paragraphs 0086, 0099).

Regarding claim 19, Edinger teaches the memory system further includes instructions executable by the processor to enable delivery of the assigned support level (page 5, paragraph 0125, page 7, paragraph 0173, page 9, paragraph 0240, page 11, paragraph 0290).

Regarding claim 21, Edinger teaches that the ACD includes access to a plurality of databases (page 2, paragraph 0027, page 4, paragraph 0099).

Regarding claim 22, Edinger teaches an agent's desktop, wherein the agent's desktop is linked to the ACD (page 4, paragraph 0098).

Regarding claim 23, Edinger teaches that the access to the customer includes a telephone interface (page 4, paragraph 0098).

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edinger et al. (U.S. 2002/0194047) in view of Sanada et al. (U.S. 2005/0177548) further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art further in view of Lawrence et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,430,866).

Regarding claim 4, Edinger in view of Sanada further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art does not specifically teach "a unit serial number, a host system serial number, a unit source and a unit part number". Lawrence teaches a unit serial number, a host system serial number, a unit source and a unit part number (fig.1, 2; col.4, lines 34-41, col.5, lines 9-11). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Edinger in view of Sanada further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art to incorporate a unit serial number, a host system serial number, a unit source and a unit part number as taught by Lawrence. The motivation for the modification is to provide detail information about the device to a support team so that the customer can get technical assistance for a particular device.

7. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edinger et al. (U.S. 2002/0194047) in view of Sanada et al. (U.S. 2005/0177548) further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art further in view of Hughes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,535,204).

Regarding claim 6, Edinger teaches that confirming the TSID includes a predetermined number of characters (page 3, paragraph 0040);

confirming the TSID matches at least one TSID entry in at least one of a plurality of databases (page 4, paragraph 0099); and

confirming the TSID matches inherently a predetermined format (page 4, paragraph 0099).

Edinger in view of Sanada further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art does not specifically teach "confirming the TSID includes a correct checksum". Hughes teaches confirming the TSID includes a correct checksum (fig.9; col.3, lines 62-64, col.13, lines 9, 10). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Edinger in view of Sanada further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art to confirm the TSID includes a correct checksum as taught by Hughes. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to enable a check for a correct reading of a number.

8. Claims 10-14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edinger et al. (U.S. 2002/0194047) in view of Sanada et al. (U.S. 2005/0177548) further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art further in view of Thomson et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0061104).

Regarding claim 10, Edinger in view of Sanada further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art does not specifically teach "classifying the TSID as an original equipment manufacturer (OEM) TSID if the TSID is associated with a unit having an OEM distribution channel in at least one of the plurality of databases". Thomson teaches classifying the TSID as an original equipment manufacturer (OEM) TSID if the TSID is associated with a unit having an OEM distribution channel in at least one of the plurality of databases (abstract; fig.3A; page 2, paragraphs 0018-0021). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Edinger in view of Sanada further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art to classify the TSID as an original equipment manufacturer (OEM) TSID if the TSID is associated with a unit having an OEM distribution channel in at least one of the plurality of databases as taught by Thomson. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide warranty information for a particular product.

Regarding claim 11, Edinger in view of Sanada further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art does not specifically teach "classifying the OEM TSID as an illicit TSID if the customer obtained the unit from a source other than the OEM distribution channel". Thomson teaches classifying the OEM TSID as a fraud [i.e., illicit] TSID if the customer obtained the unit from a source other than the OEM distribution channel (page 2, paragraph 0018, page 7, paragraph 0100). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Edinger in view of Sanada further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art to classify the OEM TSID as an illicit TSID if the customer obtained the unit from a

Art Unit: 2614

source other than the OEM distribution channel as taught by Thomson. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to detect whether warranty claim for a particular product is fraud.

Regarding claim 12, Edinger in view of Sanada further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art does not specifically teach "classifying the TSID as an illicit TSID if a unit corresponding to the TSID is identified as a counterfeit unit". Thomson teaches classifying the TSID as a fraud [i.e., illicit] TSID if a unit corresponding to the TSID is identified as a counterfeit unit (abstract; fig.3A; page 2, paragraphs 0018-0020). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Edinger in view of Sanada further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art to classifying the TSID as an illicit TSID if a unit corresponding to the TSID is identified as a counterfeit unit as taught by Thomson. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to prevent illegal use of warranty for a product.

Claim 13 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 12. Edinger in view of Sanada further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art does not specifically teach "reporting the illicit TSID". Thomson teaches reporting the fraud [i.e., illicit] TSID (page 2, paragraph 0018, page 7, paragraph 0100). (Note; reporting is inherent) Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Edinger in view of Sanada further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art to report the illicit

Art Unit: 2614

TSID as taught by Thomson. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to notify whether a particular product ID is illegal.

Claim 14 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 3. Furthermore, Edinger teaches the customer's OS is one of the plurality of aspects of the unit (page 3, paragraph 0042).

However, Edinger in view of Sanada further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art does not specifically teach "the unit corresponds to the TSID". Thomson teaches that the unit corresponds to the demographic [i.e., TSID] (page 2, paragraph 0018, page 7, paragraph 0100). (Note; reporting is inherent) Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Edinger in view of Sanada further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art to report the illicit TSID as taught by Thomson. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to receive identification for a particular product.

Regarding claim 20, Edinger in view of Sanada further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art does not specifically teach "the ACD includes a server". Thomson teaches that the ACD includes a server (page 7, paragraphs 0093, 0094, 0097, 0098). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Edinger in view of Sanada further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art to have the ACD including a server as taught by Thomson. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to handle request from a customer.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Foia et al. (U.S. 2001/0025258) teach Method for product support services;
and

Harrison et al. (U.S. 6,990,458) teach System and method for computer-aided technician dispatch and communication.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2614


11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Md S. Elahee whose telephone number is (571) 272-7536. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ME

MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE
January 29, 2007


FAN TSANG
SENIOR PATENT EXAMINER
BIOLOGY CENTER 2600